



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A PRELIMINARY STUDY OF CERTAIN MANUSCRIPTS OF SUETONIUS' LIVES OF THE CAESARS

BY CLEMENT LAWRENCE SMITH

SECOND PAPER

IN my first paper under this title¹ I published the results of an examination of some thirty manuscripts of the *De Vita Caesarum* and traced, as far as the available evidence warranted, the relations of these to the older and better known manuscripts and to one another. Without attempting a complete classification, for which my material was manifestly inadequate, I showed that the majority of the manuscripts examined by me belong to a different class from that of Codex Memmianus (*A*); and in each of the two classes thus distinguished²—to which I assigned seven and twenty-one manuscripts respectively—I was able to recognize two subordinate groups: in the first class a group represented by Memmianus itself, and one represented by the Third Medicean (*M*³);³ in the second class a 'Florentine' group of seven

¹ *Harvard Studies*, vol. XII (1901), pp. 19–58. In referring to that paper I shall cite simply the volume and page of the *Studies*.

² Quite independently, and on a much broader basis of research, L. Preud'homme, in his important *Troisième étude sur l'histoire du texte de Suétone de vita Caesarum* (Brussels, 1904), has reached a similar result, and finds the same division running through about 125 manuscripts. His two classes are essentially identical with mine, and we differ only in the assignment of a few individual manuscripts: *V*⁶ and *V*³⁵, which I placed in the second class, and *V*⁵, *V*¹³, *V*¹⁴, and *V*³⁸, which I left on the border between the two classes, though recognizing their closer affinity to the first, are by him definitely assigned to the first class. Of the manuscripts which, for lack of sufficient evidence, I refrained from classifying, M. Preud'homme assigns *P*¹, *Ven*², and *Z* to Class I; *Ven*¹ and *Ven*³ to Class II. One manuscript of my first class and four of my second (*R*¹; *V*¹ *R*² *B*³ *B*⁴) I do not find anywhere in his list. Of the manuscripts discussed in the present paper our classification agrees in the case of all except *B*⁷, which M. Preud'homme is partly in error, as I shall show (page 11), in assigning to the second class.

³ M. Preud'homme also recognizes in *M*³ and its congeners a distinct group, in which he includes (besides *M*¹) Parisinus 5801 and Montepessulanus 117 (*Troisième étude*, page 24).

copies dating from the XII.–XIV. centuries, and an ‘Urbinas’ group of seven XV. century manuscripts. A brief sojourn in Europe in the spring of 1903 gave me the opportunity to make some further observations in this field, the results of which I will here set forth.

In the Library of the Vatican

Vaticanus Latinus 6396. Parchment, 4°, XV. century.

A very brief examination of this manuscript, which escaped my notice in 1898, not being found in the Catalogue,¹ sufficed to show that it belongs to the Urbinas group. Its agreement with *U* itself is so constant that in the 46 excerpts from the *Julius* in which both are represented there is only one case of divergence, and that of no significance: 31, 31 quodam (for quondam).

*V*⁴ Vaticanus Latinus 1904.

My attention having been called to some errors in the collation of this manuscript which I used in preparing my first paper,² I took the opportunity to verify all my excerpts and found them inaccurate in twelve places, where the correct reading is as follows: 32, 26 libris *om.*; 39, 18 confiteri; 42, 16 pansa equidem ad eos; 44, 31 cleopatra liberis; 46, 5 integri temasini; 52, 36 ad exemplar; 53, 34 senatores; 55, 36 in exprobratis; 58, 11 magnorum; 74, 28 tiburis; 80, 34 demisso e caelo; 85, 30 altero quae.

These corrections disarrange my examples somewhat, — for instance, the list of twelve places in which I held that *V*⁴ (against *A*) was ‘certainly right’³ must be reduced to eight; but they do not materially affect the evidence by which I showed the close relation of *V*⁴ to *A* on the one hand, and to *M*³ on the other;⁴ nor do they disturb my conclusion that *V*⁴, though standing nearer to the Medicean than to the Memmianus group,⁵ is not to be included in either. Its relation to

¹ See vol. XII, p. 21, footnote.

² I am indebted to Professor Ihm for calling my attention to the inaccuracy of this collation.

³ Vol. XII, p. 46.

⁴ Vol. XII, pp. 44–48.

⁵ This is also the view of M. Preud’homme, in whose scheme (*Trois. étude*, pp. 24 ff., 61) *V*⁴ and the archetype (*x*) of what I have called the Medicean group have their common source in a manuscript (*x*) closely related to *A*.

the two groups is neatly illustrated by the variants at 91, 29, where the archetype apparently had *EXSERVISSEIVS*. In the Memmianus group this has been transformed by haplography into *ex seruis eius*. *M*⁸ has preserved, with a slight change of spelling, the right reading, *exeruisse ius*, corrected in *R*¹, a later manuscript of the Medicean group, to the more intelligible *exercuisse ius*. *V*⁴ agrees with *M*⁸ in preserving the verb, but goes its own way and gives us, by dittography, *exseruisse eius*. The independence of *V*⁴ is vouched for by such examples as the following :

- | | | |
|--------|---|--|
| 10, 6 | licerentur <i>AV</i> ⁴ | ducerentur <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 11, 23 | alias addit <i>AV</i> ⁴ | aliis additis <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 19, 22 | exulabant <i>AV</i> ⁴ | exularent <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 22, 29 | uasa <i>AV</i> ⁴ | ut uasa <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 25, 18 | et ait uero <i>AV</i> ⁴ | uero <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 27, 29 | conibebat <i>AV</i> ⁴ | cohibebat <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 32, 26 | detineretur <i>AV</i> ⁴ | containeretur <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 35, 1 | maximo aequintus <i>AV</i> ⁴ | maximae quintus <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 38, 14 | minos gentes <i>AV</i> ⁴ | minis gentis <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 49, 15 | ut c. <i>AV</i> ⁴ | et brutum <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 50, 28 | praesident idem <i>AV</i> ⁴ | prae se identidem <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 55, 23 | uirili toga <i>AV</i> ⁴ | uirilem togam <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 62, 10 | sedulo lentius <i>AV</i> ⁴ | sedulo uiolentius <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 73, 32 | etiam memoriam <i>AV</i> ⁴ | etiam in memoriam <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 80, 21 | in eius signum rei p. quam <i>AV</i> ⁴ | in sinum eius signum rei |
| p. | quod <i>M</i> ⁸ | |
| 85, 16 | quinques <i>AV</i> ⁴ | quinque <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 7, 6 | adiutore <i>A</i> | auctore <i>V</i> ⁴ <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 11, 17 | consulatus <i>A</i> | consularis <i>V</i> ⁴ <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 18, 19 | ac <i>A</i> | et <i>V</i> ⁴ <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 26, 32 | moranti se <i>A</i> | moranti <i>V</i> ⁴ <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 33, 35 | laureo <i>A</i> | aureo <i>V</i> ⁴ <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 36, 18 | adinspectantium <i>A</i> | inspectantium <i>V</i> ⁴ <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 38, 16 | magno inter <i>A</i> | magno intervallo <i>V</i> ⁴ <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 39, 18 | profiteri <i>A</i> | confiteri <i>V</i> ⁴ <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 46, 29 | abim <i>A</i> | abin <i>V</i> ⁴ <i>M</i> ⁸ |
| 50, 21 | primum <i>A</i> | primo <i>V</i> ⁴ <i>M</i> ⁸ |

- 61, 35 ne *A* et ne *V*⁴ *M*³
 67, 37 impatientiam *A* patientiam *V*⁴ *M*³
 71, 4 in urbem *A* extra urbem *V*⁴ *M*³
 74, 37 primam *A* pilam *V*⁴ *M*³
 83, 11 rerumque missilia *A* rerumque missilium *V*⁴ *M*³

In the Ambrosian Library at Milan

Am Ambrosianus H. 90. Parchment, small folio, early XV. century.

Ambrosianus H. 144. Paper, 4°, early XV. century (1432).

The first of these two I excerpted fully through the *Julius*. It is a manuscript of the second class, akin to *B*³ and *B*⁴, with which it will be discussed below. The second is in a deplorable state, largely moth-eaten, and apparently still food for moths. I made no excerpts.

In the British Museum

*B*⁴ Lat. Cl. 12009. Parchment, XV. century.

This manuscript, which for lack of time I had been obliged to pass over in 1898, I excerpted for the *Julius*. It proves to be of the second class, and closely related to *B*³ (Lat. Cl. 31914); and in these two, together with the Ambrosian codex (*Am*) mentioned above, and probably the Leyden codex (*L*), we appear to have come upon a third group in the second class. The Milan and London codices are found to agree, in the excerpts in which comparison can be made, about five times out of six (*Am B*³ 51:10; *Am B*⁴ 54:10; *B*³ *B*⁴ 48:12). In the case of *L* the amount of divergence is greater (*Am L* 39:10; *B*³ *L* 63:18; *B*⁴ *L* 37:14), owing to the fact that *L* has acquired a number of readings peculiar to itself, such as 11, 23 alias publico; 24, 5 eloquentis; 50, 28 praesedens identidem prae se; 55, 36 ex improbatis; 56, 10 romani populi. These figures are by no means decisive, but the conclusion to which they point is confirmed on a closer inspection of the various readings.¹ The cases in my excerpts from the *Julius* in which *Am B*³ *B*⁴ fail to agree are as follows:

- 3, 8 iulius caesar annum agens *Am B*⁴ annum iulius caesar agens
*B*³ annum agens caesar *L*
 4, 5 regiae *B*³ reginae *B*⁴ regi *Am L*

¹ For the excerpts from *B*³ and *L* see vol. XII, p. 24 ff.

- 9, 37 quicquam *Am* quidquam *L* quiddam *B³ B⁴*
 10, 32 uaticinia *Am B³* uatinia *B⁴*
 11, 1 assiria *Am B⁴* assyria *B³ L*
 12, 18 et *Am L* sed *B³ B⁴*
 13, 2 prosequatur *Am B⁴ L* persequatur *B³*
 14, 16 aduentu fecerat suo *Am B⁴* aduentu suo fecerat *B³ L*
 14, 37 imperii *Am B⁴ L* *om. B³* regni *B₂³*
 22, 29 ut uasa *Am B³* ut nasa *B⁴* et uasa *L*
 23, 19 a proconsule *Am B³ L* proconsule *B⁴*
 27, 29 conuiuebat *Am B³ L* conuiuebat *B⁴*
 31, 26 amplius *Am* amprius *B³ B⁴ L*
 31, 31 exta sacra *Am B³ L* exacta sacra *B⁴*
 32, 28 sententia causa *Am L* sententia tam *B⁴* summa causa *B³*

Some of these are of the nature of exceptions that prove the rule, as 4, 5 and 27, 29, where a reading which *B³* shares with a very small number of manuscripts appears slightly varied in *B⁴*. Three or four at most might be held to prove the influence of other manuscripts. Nearly all readily explain themselves as the result of easy errors or intentional corrections or similar causes which are at work in the making of every manuscript. They have little force against the positive evidence of the list that follows, which includes those places only in which *Am B³ B⁴*, and usually *L*, are found in agreement against one or both of the other groups of the second class :

- 4, 17 et triumphalem uirum *Am B³ B⁴ L Flor* triumphalemque uirum *Urb*
 4, 34 tribunatu *Am B³ B⁴ L* tribunatum *Flor Urb*
 4, 35 auctores *Am B³ B⁴ L* auctoresque *Flor Urb*
 5, 18 mandatu *Flor* mandato *Am B³ B⁴ L Urb*
 9, 23 accensus *Am B³ B⁴ L Flor* accensus funis (or ter funis) *Urb*
 11, 17 consulatu *Flor Urb* consularis *Am B³ B⁴*
 12, 18 et *Am B³ B⁴ L Urb* sed *Flor*
 12, 33 praedia *Am B³ B⁴ Flor* prandia *Urb*
 13, 34 temptante *Am B³ B⁴ Flor* tempestate *Urb L*
 15, 27 exhortandoque *Am B³ B⁴ Flor* adhortandoque (or -dum-que) *Urb*
 24, 25 caesaris *Am B³ B⁴ L Urb* *om. Flor*

26, 32 moranti cuspidē *Am B⁸ B⁴ L* moranti secus cuspidē *Flor Urb*

29, 18 et in *Am B⁸ B⁴ L* in *Flor Urb*

30, 34 notas *Am B⁸ B⁴ L Urb* nota *Flor*

32, 14 seu parum *Flor Urb* seu propter parum *Am B⁸ B⁴ L*

33, 25 iulo *Am B⁸ B⁴ L* iulio *Urb* ilio *Flor*

33, 27 cuius rei *Urb* quam rem *Am B⁸ B⁴ Flor*

We have here sufficient evidence to show that *Am B⁸ B⁴ L*, which for convenience I shall call the Ambrosian group, represent a tradition to some extent distinct from those represented by the other groups of the second class. To illustrate now how the several groups of both classes array themselves in support of various readings I give the following examples from the *Julius*:

4, 17 et triumphalem *Class I* et triumphalem uirum *Flor Ambr triumphalemque uirum Urb*

4, 30 desiderē *Mem Flor Urb Ambr* dissidē *V⁴ Med*

4, 34 tribunatu *Class I Ambr* tribunatum *Flor Urb*

4, 35 actores *Class I* auctores *Ambr* auctoresque *Flor Urb*

9, 8 pollicendi *Flor Urb Ambr* pollicenti *Class I*

9, 23 accensus *Class I Flor Ambr* accensus funis (or ter funis) *Urb*

10, 6 licerentur *Mem V⁴ Flor Urb Ambr* ducerentur *Med*

11, 17 consulatus *Mem* consulatu *Flor Urb* consularis *V⁴ Med Ambr*

11, 23 alias priuato sumptu addidit *Flor Urb Ambr* a. p. s. addit *Mem V⁴* aliis p. s. additis *Med*

12, 18 et *Urb Ambr* sed *Class I Flor*

12, 33 praedia *Class I Flor Ambr* prandia *Urb*

16, 12 et fugientem *Flor Urb Ambr* effugientem *Class I*

17, 9 dextra atque *Flor Urb Ambr* dextraque *Class I*

18, 4 regione *Class I* in regione *Flor Urb Ambr*

18, 19 ac *Mem Flor Urb Ambr* et *V⁴ Med*

22, 6 ecce—gallias *Flor Urb Ambr* om. *Class I*

22, 27 aurum . . . effutuisti *Class I* auro . . . stuprum emisti *Flor Urb Ambr*

24, 2 oratorum *Flor Urb Ambr* oratorem *Class I*

- 24, 25 caesaris *Class I Urb Ambr* om. *Flor*
 29, 18 deuersorio (or diuersorio) loco *Class I* in div. loco *Flor*
Urb et in div. loco *Ambr*
 30, 34 notas *Mem Med Urb Ambr* nota *V⁴ Flor*
 32, 14 seu parum *Class I Flor Urb* seu propter parum *Ambr*
 32, 26 libris *Flor Urb Ambr* om. *Class I*
 33, 25 iulo *Med Ambr* iulio *V⁴ Urb* ilio *Mem Flor*
 33, 27 cuius rei *Class I Urb* quam rem *Flor Ambr*

Of the remaining manuscripts in the British Museum¹ I selected for examination in the limited time at my disposal these two :

*B*⁶ Lat. Class. Arundel 32. Paper, 4°, XV. century.

*B*⁷ Lat. Class. 21098. Paper, small 4°, XV. century.

The Arundel manuscripts in the Museum were transferred to that institution from the Royal Society in 1831. The largest part of them, according to the Catalogue, were purchased by the Earl of Arundel in Nuremberg in 1636. That *B*⁶ was in this Nuremberg collection is not stated, but is not improbable. It is of Italian origin, the writer giving his name as 'M. Terentius lunensis.' It contains the twelve lives, as twelve books, occupying 113 leaves, with 33 lines to a page. It is written in a plain, business-like, semi-cursive hand, with no attempt at calligraphy or ornamentation of any kind, except here and there a dash of red drawn obliquely across a letter — usually a capital² — and superscriptions in red. Space has been left at the beginning of each life for a large capital initial, but has not been filled. Otherwise the text is written solid, interrupted by no subject-headings or paragraph marks. There are marginal capitula, some in red, some in black by a later hand. There are no corrections except a few in the text by the writer himself. The Greek passages are omitted entirely, sometimes ignored ;

¹ The Museum possesses thirteen manuscripts of the *Lives*: Regius 15.C.III, XII. century; Regius 15.C.IV.1, early XIII. century; and the following of the XV. century: Lat. Class. 12009, 12010, 21098, 24913, 31914, Arundel 32, Lansdowne 838, Harley 5342.64a, Burney 259 and 260, Sloane 2509.

² This trick of the scribes has the effect of making the letter *i* resemble *y*, and is no doubt responsible in many cases for such misspellings as *tyberius*, *ymagine*, *Ynfanti*, *Yre*, etc.

usually, however, a blank space has been left, often with a Latin version written over it in red or after it in black.

The insertion of a Latin version of the Greek passages and the division into twelve books are features which the Arundel codex has in common with the Third Medicean, and these indications of kinship with that codex are confirmed by the evidence of the excerpts, which assigns to B^6 a place somewhat similar to that of R^1 in the Medicean group of the first class. While exhibiting unmistakable traces of its derivation from the archetype of Class I, it has suffered numerous 'corrections' from other sources. The following are some of the characteristic readings of Class I which it retains: 4, 35 actores; 18, 4 regione; 34, 8 ouio; 39, 29 carmensis; 47, 3 ultus est; 48, 3 ignominia; 48, 18 urbis; 49, 17 decimum; 52, 25 flamonium; 53, 35 tabulas; 57, 29 partimque; 89, 18 troiam; 114, 30 patria; 163, 28 defuit et ueterum; 183, 27 ueste; 227, 12 antiqua erat; 238, 11 aduerso rumore; 240, 20 uerum. Where the reading of the archetype was manifestly wrong or meaningless it has been corrected; thus we find 14, 16 aduentu suo (for sui); 21, 30 ad uinum (for ui); etc. In a few cases these 'corrections' may have been independent, but they are usually derived from some manuscript of the second class, as 4, 17 triumphalem uirum (for triumphalem); 21, 6 recentiora (for retiora); 22, 6 ecce — gallias, etc.

In spite of these corrections and corruptions B^6 maintains a distinct preponderance of agreement with A (47:38), and still more so with M^8 (54:28). Where A and M^8 part company B^6 sides with A against M^8 in a few cases:

- | | | | |
|---------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 4, 30 | desidere $A B^6$ | dissidere M^8 | |
| 10, 32 | uatinia $A B^6$ | uaticinia M^8 | |
| 19, 22 | exulabat B^6 | exulabant A | exularent M^8 |
| 34, 8 | ouio $A B^6$ | obuio M^8 | |
| 50, 21 | primum $A B^6$ | primo M^8 | |
| 71, 4 | in $A B^6$ | extra M^8 | |
| 85, 30 | quem $A B^6$ | quae M^8 | |
| 131, 33 | notos in bonam partem $A B^6$ | notos M^8 | |

Much more numerous and more significant are the places in which B^6 agrees with M^8 against A . I have counted in my excerpts fifty-four such places, of which the following may serve as examples:

- 7, 6 auctore *M³ B⁶* adiutore *A*
 10, 6 ducerentur *M³ B⁶* licerentur *A*
 11, 23 aliis . . . additis *M³ B⁶* alias . . . addit *A*
 26, 32 moranti cuspide *M³ B⁶* moranti se cuspide *A*
 33, 25 iulo *M³* iulio *B⁶* ilio *A*
 33, 35 aureo *M³ B⁶* laureo *A*
 38, 14 minis gentis *M³ B⁶* minos gentes *A*
 39, 18 confiteri *M³ B⁶* profiteri *A*
 40, 30 autem *M³ B⁶* eum *A*
 42, 3 hac fraude *M³ B⁶* ac fraude *A*
 44, 31 de cleopatrae liberis *M³ B⁶* de cleopatra liberis *A*
 50, 28 prae se identidem *M³ B⁶* praesident idem *A*
 55, 23 uirilem togam *M³ B⁶* uirili toga *A*
 78, 9 ipse *M³ B⁶* ipse ei *A*
 80, 21 in sinum eius signum rei p . quod *M³ B⁶* in eius signum
 rei p . quam *A*
 83, 11 rerumque missilium *M³ B⁶* rerumque missilia *A*
 85, 16 quinque *M³ B⁶* quinques *A*
 93, 11 ignota *M³ B⁶* ignoti *A*
 141, 1 omnem urbem *M³ B⁶* urbem omnem *A*
 147, 13 magna ui *M³ B⁶* nauī *A*
 192, 4 male fracto *M³ B⁶* male facto *A*
 211, 16 erat *M³ B⁶* tulerat *A*
 217, 27 suae *M³ B⁶* uenetae *A*
 224, 7 incertum sponte an *M³ B⁶* an *A*
 253, 9 canum *M³ B⁶* incanum *A*

In orthography *B⁶* is distinctly superior to the average mediaeval or renaissance manuscript. Not that there is any lack of the ordinary mistakes of copying; but its real errors of orthography are for the most part confined to those that arise from the confusion of *c* and *t* or *i* and *y*, or from the misplacement of the aspirate. Thus we find both *acies* and *aties*, *otium* and *ocium*; *contio*, *concio*, and *conctio*; *sectius*, *suspictiones*; *dimictebat*, *actritus*; *prouintia* (found in *A* also); *circha*, *cathenati*, *cohercuerat*, *introhire*; *ymagine*, *tyberius*, *silla*; ¹ and there are the usual distortions of proper names. But there are no barbarisms

¹ See above, p. 7, footnote.

like *mihi* and *nihil*; and, on the other hand, we meet here and there with forms which we must recognize as survivals from the archetype.¹ I have noted a few examples. The accusative plural of *i*-stems usually ends in *-es*, but often in *-is*, as 31, 19 pluris; 38, 14 gentis (in which the ending has been protected by the corrupt form of the adjective, minis); 39, 35 octobris; 205, 5 recusantis; 205, 6 flagitantis. In nouns and adjectives with stems in *-io-*, *-ia-*, a single *-i-*, for *-ii-*, is found in a few places, as 12, 1 stipendi; 211, 31 lepticaris; likewise in verb forms from perfect stems in *-iui-*, as 4, 13 redit; 14, 28 petissem; 42, 12 subisse. Compounds of *iacio* usually have *-ii-*, but *-i-* is not infrequent, as 26, 36 traiceret; 33, 13 deicerent; 33, 20 disicerent; 40, 11 obiciatur; 42, 18 adicit, etc. Prepositional prefixes are ordinarily assimilated, but the unmodified form often occurs, as 15, 28 adfirmaret; 18, 22 adlegit; 26, 12 obprobrium; 207, 9 adsimilis; 211, 16 adfuturi; 214, 22 adnexo, etc. There are a few instances of *-qu-* for *-cu-*, as 4, 38 sequi; 207, 22 alloquturi. Most striking of all is the spelling of the temporal conjunction *cum*, which is regularly written *quom*, while the preposition is regularly written *cum*. The unfamiliar distinction has not been observed with entire consistency by the scribes, who have sometimes lapsed into *cum* for the conjunction and sometimes overdone the matter by writing the preposition *quom*. Thus in the *Caligula* and *Claudius* together, out of 79 occurrences of the conjunction (leaving out of the count a few cases where the text is corrupt), it is written *quom* 62 times, and *cum* 17 times; while the preposition, which occurs 43 times, appears as *cum* in all cases except four: 139, 21 quom exigua manu; 139, 37 quom equitatu; 148, 33 simul quom fratre; 153, 23 quom cetera turba. In this respect our manuscript bears some resemblance to the palimpsest of Fronto.

The other forms of which examples are given in the foregoing paragraph are undoubtedly survivals of sound tradition. Is *quom* likewise

¹ See Roth, Praef. xxxvi. Roth is no doubt right in accepting the more archaic forms found in *A* as authentic. Whether Suetonius used the archaic and the contemporary conventional forms of the same word indifferently is another question. The mixed spelling of *A* may well be due to the gradual encroachment of the conventional orthography of the scribes on the peculiar spelling of Suetonius (cf. Preud'homme, *Troisième étude*, pp. 20 f.), and *B*⁸ may represent a more advanced stage of the same process.

traditional, or does it merely represent the unwarranted opinion of some mediaeval scholar? The testimony of our manuscript rather suggests than answers this question. Of this much, I think, we may rest assured : the form was not first introduced into *B*⁶. It is plain that the writer of that manuscript had no well defined views on orthography ; he copied what he found in his original. Back of this we cannot go. There is nothing intrinsically improbable in the supposition that Suetonius, like some of his contemporaries,¹ distinguished the conjunction from the preposition by writing it *quom*, and that this spelling has disappeared in nearly all of our manuscripts ; but the unsupported testimony of *B*⁶ cannot be said to carry us very far on the way to such a conclusion. The whole question of Suetonian orthography, however, deserves a more thorough investigation than it has yet received, and to that end I have set down the evidence of *B*⁶ for whatever it may be worth.

The other manuscript which I examined, *B*⁷, is a composite production both in its handwriting and in its text. It is written in six unequal instalments, apparently by as many different scribes ; and the text is derived from two very different sources. As far as 97, 33, where the work of the second scribe ends, and perhaps a little farther, the text belongs to the Medicean group of the first class ; while from this point to 230, 7 grauissima increpuit (*Vesp.* 8), where it breaks off incomplete, it belongs to the Florentine group of the second class. As the text stops at the end of a quire, we may suppose the copy was once complete and has suffered the loss of one quire. There has also been some disarrangement of the leaves : the order of foll. 28–34 should be 29, 28, 31, 30, 32, 34, 33. In the part of the text belonging to the first class the Greek passages are given, sometimes with a Latin version superscribed, as in *V*⁴ and *M*⁸ ; in the other part the spaces left for the Greek remain unfilled.

The first part, like *B*⁶ and *R*¹, is a much corrected text, which still retains a decided preponderance of agreement with the representative manuscripts of the first class, particularly with *M*⁸ (*B*⁷ *A* 44 : 24 ; *B*⁷ *V*⁴ 48 : 20 ; *B*⁷ *M*⁸ 56 : 12), as well as more specific evidence of its origin in numerous survivals of characteristic readings of that class.

¹ Cf. Terentius Scaurus, VII, p. 28 K.

The following may serve as examples: 4, 35 actores; 22, 27 aurum . . . effutuisti; 31, 31 exta quondam; 32, 26 libris *om.*; 47, 3 ultus est; 48, 18 urbis; 49, 17 decimum; 52, 4 ut qui; 52, 25 flamonium; 53, 3 exempli; 58, 11 puerorum; 74, 28 tiburī; 85, 11 sextam; 85, 28 tribus; 86, 10 atque; 89, 18 troiam.

Where *A* and *M*⁸ disagree, *B*⁷ is found in pretty constant agreement with the latter. There are 42 such cases in my excerpts from this part of the text, in two of which *B*⁷ differs from both of the older manuscripts. It sides with *A* in four places: 4, 30 desiderare; 10, 6 licerentur; 10, 32 uatinia; 19, 22 exulabant. In the remaining 36 places it sides with *M*⁸ against *A*. I forbear to give examples, which would be mainly a repetition of the list given above¹ for *B*⁶. In 4, 5 regiae, *B*⁷ approaches *V*⁴, but I have noticed no other indication of special resemblance to that manuscript. It clearly belongs, in this part of its text, to the Medicean group.

In the other part (from 97, 33, or thereabouts, to the end) *B*⁷ is closely related to Vaticanus 1860 (*V*⁰). In 64 excerpts in which both manuscripts are represented there are only seven cases of disagreement, and these are evidently due in every instance to unconscious error, with the possible exception of 194, 19 praefectorum (for peccatorum). On the other hand, *B*⁷ faithfully follows *V*⁰ in all its peculiar readings, good and bad, such as 111, 27 cum coniugibus; 127, 18 quercina; 188, 38 perusurum; 192, 4 labefacto; 208, 19 addidit; 214, 19 claudusque; 217, 27 ueterem, etc.; it reproduces the grosser interpolations of *V*⁰, of which I gave some examples in my account of that manuscript;² and finally it has the same transposition in the *Galba*, with the passages in the same order.³ From all this we may infer that *B*⁷, in this part of its text, was copied directly either from *V*⁰ or, more probably, from the common archetype of *V*⁰ and *V*¹.

A word, in conclusion, about the value of the XV. century manuscripts, which have engaged a large share of our attention in these studies, and to which — for that reason, I suppose — one or two of my

¹ Page 9.

² Vol. XII, p. 50.

³ See vol. XII, p. 48. The part of the *Vespasian* in which the great lacuna of *V*⁰ occurs was in the lost quire of *B*⁷.

excellent critics think I attach undue importance. In point of fact, I have nowhere attempted to say how much importance should be assigned to them, nor am I yet prepared to do so. I certainly cannot acquiesce in the comfortable assurance of Roth, that these manuscripts may be safely neglected, and I adduced some proof of the unsoundness of this view. But no proof ought to be needed. Roth, quite arbitrarily, set apart the XV. century manuscripts as a class by themselves, and from a somewhat imperfect acquaintance with a few of them pronounced them one and all of no authority, — surely a most unscientific procedure. Manuscripts cannot be assembled in lots, like so much merchandise, and priced by samples. They must be examined, each for itself, and their relations so far as possible determined; and when this has been done it will be time to pronounce judgment on their value and importance.

In the present instance such an examination is, in my opinion, distinctly worth while, and may prove fruitful in two ways. It may bring to light individual manuscripts of exceptional value, as being directly copied from originals of much earlier date. We have an example of this kind in Monacensis, a paper codex of most unpromising appearance, which proved on examination to be a faithful reproduction of a text written at least four centuries before.¹ It happens in this instance that we have a much older representative of the same text in Gudianus 268 (*G*²), of the XI. century, so that the discovery of the character of Monacensis did not add materially to our resources; but it may at least serve to suggest that in the multitude of XV. century manuscripts there may be others of the same sort, which are the *sole* representatives of their much earlier originals. Again, if we can establish groups and sub-classes among these manuscripts, of which I have pointed out clear indications, we can work back to an earlier stage of the tradition in that way. And we cannot well dispense with any aid these late manuscripts may have to give us. In the first class our need is not so very urgent; for here we are fairly well provided with older

¹ Whether it is a copy of *G*², as Professor Ihm thinks (*Hermes* 37, 593 ff.), or of the original of *G*², as I was 'disposed to think, while waiting for further evidence' (vol. XII, p. 42). Professor Ihm is at much pains to refute what he calls my 'hypothesis,' and contributes some additional evidence, but his arguments are hardly conclusive.

copies, headed by Memmianus, whose preëminence no one disputes, though it must be used with discrimination, as indeed Roth used it; but in the second class, where we have nothing earlier than the XII. century, it may easily happen that a single XV. century manuscript, or a group of them, will prove to be quite as good a representative of the archetype of the class as any of the older copies. The second class, in fact, is still, for the most part, an undigested mass, which must be organized in some fashion before we can make effective use of it; and in working out this problem the XV. century manuscripts, which make up the great majority of the class, may by no means be left out of the account.

For these reasons the exploration of the manuscripts should go on; and as there will be no opportunity for me to take any further part in it, I may here express the hope that the work may be taken up by other hands and carried to completion.